DITEST FUE OCCY ORIGINAL

Rr-

## Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

Washington, L	D.C. 20554	CEIVED
In the Matter of	)	FEDERAL COUNTY 7 1994
Open Network Architecture Tariffs of Bell Operating Companies	) cc )	Docket No. 92-91 THE SECRETARY ISSION

## AMERITECH'S OPPOSITION TO MCI'S PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Ameritech Operating Companies (Ameritech),<sup>1</sup> pursuant to § 1.106 of the Federal Communication Commission's (Commission) Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.106, oppose the Petition for Reconsideration (PFR) filed by MCI Telecommunications Corp. (MCI) of the Commission's Order issued December 15, 1993 in the above captioned matter.<sup>2</sup> In the PFR, MCI attempts one last time to challenge Bell operating companies' (BOC) Open Network Architecture (ONA) rates. MCI raises the same issues it has raised numerous times in the past which the Commission has already rejected. The Commission should reject these claims again.

In its PFR, MCI claims that it did not have an adequate opportunity to participate in the Commission's investigation of the BOCs' ONA tariffs.

Specifically, MCI claims that the Commission's inadequate disclosure of the SCIS cost model resulted in MCI's inability to properly review and challenge the filed rates. Consequently, MCI claims that the Commission has violated the Communications Act and the Administrative Procedures Act.

No. of Copies rec'd\_C List A B C D E

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Ameritech Operating Companies are: Illinois Bell Telephone Company, Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Inc., Michigan Bell Telephone Company, The Ohio Bell Telephone Company, and Wisconsin Bell, Inc.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Open Network Architecture Tariffs of Bell Operating Companies, CC Dkt. No. 92-91, FCC 93-532, 8 FCC Rcd. (released December 15, 1993) (Order).

Despite these claims, MCI has been granted substantial opportunity to review and comment on both the methodology used by the BOCs for determining their ONA rates and the ONA rates themselves. In fact, in its opposition to the BOCs' ONA rates, MCI raised numerous questions regarding the BOCs' ONA rates. In this regard, MCI argued that the substantial differences between the BOCs' ONA rates indicated that the rates were unjustified, and several questions about the type of information which was inputted into the SCIS model, such as whether the information was recent or one to two years old, whether the information properly represented the mix of each BOCs' switches, whether the information should reflect the embedded or prospective cost of the switches, as well as the cost of money used in the formula.<sup>3</sup> MCI also commented on other aspects of the ONA rates unrelated to the use of the SCIS model. For example, MCI questioned different BOCs' administrative overheads and variances between BOCs' BSE rates and their unit costs. Based on those comments, MCI clearly had sufficient knowledge to actively participate in the investigation of the ONA tariffed rates.

In reality, this PFR is an attempt to once again raise the issue of the use of the SCIS model as part of ONA ratemaking — an issue which the Commission and the courts have addressed *ad nauseam*. MCI's actual complaint — which it raises once again in a PFR of the Commission's recent order on SCIS disclosure — is that the Redaction II version of the SCIS model was inadequate. However, the SCIS model was properly found to be a trade secret and exempt from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, which is a part of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> <u>See e.g.</u> Order at ¶ 11 note 21; ¶ 15 note 29; and ¶ 31.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See MCI's Petition For Reconsideration, filed January 14, 1994, of <u>Commission Requirements for Cost Support Material to be Filed with Open Network Architecture Access Tariffs</u>, FCC 93-531, 8 FCC Rcd. (released December 15, 1993) (SCIS Disclosure Order).

Administrative Procedures Act.<sup>5</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552. Under these circumstances, the Commission provided more than sufficient access to the SCIS model through establishing procedures to examine the redacted versions of the SCIS model and perform sensitivity analyses. Moreover, the Commission provided for an independent audit of the SCIS model by Arthur Andersen, which filed a report and responded to specific inquiries by the Commission and intervenors.

Based on the foregoing, the Commission has provided adequate reasoning and justification for its treatment of the SCIS model and its findings on the BOCs' ONA tariffed rates. Consequently, the Commission has not violated either the Communications Act or the APA by allowing the BOCs to use the SCIS model as a part of its overall rate development for ONA tariffed rates. Therefore, MCI's Petition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

By: <u>Sarboro</u> Kern/ha
Barbara J. Kern

Attorney for the Ameritech Operating Companies

2000 W. Ameritech Center Dr. 4H88 Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025 (708) 248-6077

Date: January 27, 1994

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> SCIS Disclosure Order at ¶ 2-3.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Diana M. Lucas, do hereby certify that copies of the foregoing were sent via first class mail, postage prepaid, to the following on this the 27th day of Janauary 1994:

BY: Diena M Lucas / tra

Diana M. Lucas

James S. Blaszak Charles C. Hunter Gardner, Carton & Douglas 1301 K Street, NW Suite 900 - East Tower Washington, DC 20005

J. Scott Nicholls
Roy L. Morris
Alinet Communications Services,
Inc.
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Lawrence W. Katz
David K. Hall
Edward D. Young, III
Bell Atlantic Telephone
Companies
1710 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Michael J. Ettner
General Services Administration
Personal Property Division
18th & F Streets, N.W.
Room 4002
Washington, DC 20405

Francine J. Berry
David P. Condit
Peter H. Jacoby
AT&T
Room 3244J1
295 North Maple Avenue
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

James F. Britt
Executive Director
Bell Communications Research
LCC 2E-243
290 West Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Livingston, NJ 07039

William B. Barfield Attorney for BellSouth 1155 Peachtree St., N.E., Room 1800 Atlanta, GA 30367

L. Michaell Boeckman

Counsel for Ericsson Network

Systems

730 International Parkway

Richardson, TX 75081

Kathleen Levitz
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Stan Wiggins, Esq.
Senior Attorney
Tarriff Division, Common Carrier
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Peter A. Rohrbach Karis A. Hastings Hogan & Hartson 555 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20004 Richard E. Wiley
Michael Yourshaw
William B. Baker
Counsel for American Newspaper
Publishers Association
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, N.W.
Washington. DC 20006

Randall B. Lowe
John E. Hoover
Michael R. Carper
Counsel for Metromedia
Communications Corporation
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
1450 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Gregory Vogt, Esq.
Chief, Tariff Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Albert Halprin
Stephen L. Goodman
Halprin & Goodman
1301 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1020 East
Washington, DC 20005

Larry A. Blossner
Frank K. Krogh
Donald J. Elardo
MCI Telecommunications Corp.
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Paul DeJongh
Northern Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 13010
Research Triangle
Park, NC 27709-3010

Jo Ann Goodard Riley
Director
Federal Regulatory Relations
Pacific Telesis
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004

William C. Sullivan
Attorney for
Southwestern Bell
1010 Pine St., Room 2305
St. Louis, MO 63101

U S West Communications, Inc. Suite 700 1020 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036 Mary McDermott

NYNEX Telephone Companies
120 Bloomingdale Road

White Plains, NY 10605

Daryle L. Avery
Peter Wolfe
Public Service Commission of the
District of Columbia
450 Fifth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Leon M. Kestenbaum
Jay C. Keithley
H. Richard Juhnke
Sprint Communications Company
LP
1850 M Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036